Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
FEB 1 1967
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1966.

No. 758

PAUL NEHRING, JR.,
Petitioner-Appellant,

vs.

CITY OF DE KALB, COUNTY OF DE KALB, V. H. GRANDGEORGE, MAY PENROD, J. CLAYTON POOLER AND C. A. BORINE,
Defendants-Appellees.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS.

PETITION FOR REHEARING.

PAUL NEHRING, JR.,
335 College Ave.,
De Kalb, Illinois,
Phone 756-2741,
Area Code 815,
Appellant, Pro Se.

THE BLAKELY PRINTING COMPANY, CHICAGO

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1966.

Case No. 758.

PAUL NEHRING, JR.,
Petitioner-Appellant,

vs.

CITY OF DE KALB, COUNTY OF DE KALB, V. H. GRANDGEORGE, MAY PENROD, J. CLAYTON POOLER and C. A. BORINE,
Defendants-Appellees.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS.

PETITION FOR REHEARING.

May it please the Honorable Earl Warren and his Associate Justices:

Now Comes Paul Nehring, Jr. and petitions this Court to grant a rehearing on the merits of the solution needed to re-establish justice in Illinois, by granting the relief sought in the petition heretofore filed in this cause.

The Petitioner has read Rules 58 (1) and (2) and while the cases cover this plea in part, he believes that the criminal cases of *Escobedo* v. *Illinois,* 378 U. S. 478 (1964) and *Miranda* v. *Arizona,* 384 U. S. 436 (1966), set up the funda-

mental principle this Court followed in part, and suggests to the Court that laymen litigants should have the same treatment as laymen defendants in criminal cases.

The Petitioner attended a Seminar on those cases in Chicago, as he wanted to hear the analysis counsels made of this Court's ruling, and he was surprised that only one of the speakers admitted, "That we brought these decisions by our own actions, in not following the Constitution."

However, the point all seemed to overlook is the one the Petitioner raises here. In releasing the prisoners because of a failure to comply with the Constitution, they were set free to do over again what should not have been done in the first place and the public will suffer if they repeat their criminal act in two ways: actual damage to the public personally and in the tax increase made necessary by their retrials.

In denying certiorari, the Judges involved in this case will refuse to make the clerks keep and preserve Court Records, and so this litigant, and others, are always at the mercy of the judge who disregards the Constitutional Amendment that he must be heard.

Since the above was written, the Chicago Law Bulletin came out with an article entitled the **"Highest Court Determined to Police the Police"**:

> "The editor of the Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science said the U. S. Supreme Court 'has been determined all along to do its own policing of the police' regardless of the efforts of private groups and governmental agencies to solve law enforcement problems."
>
> "The court by its 5-4 decision in the 1966 case of *Miranda* v. *Arizona* has nullified much of the work of governmental commissions and private groups which have been studying the interrogation-confession problem, said Northwestern University law professor Fred E. Inbau."

What Mr. Inbau is ignoring is the fact that the various Supreme Courts have refused to follow the Constitution for some 100 years covering criminal convictions:

> "A one-man majority of the court in *Miranda* 'Pulled the rug' from underneath all of these studies and research groups, and effectively foreclosed a final evaluation of their ultimate findings and recommendations."

This Petitioner is appealing to this Court to pull out the second rug and condemn the actions of a State Supreme Court who makes decisions without briefs or abstracts when it affects civil actions in violation of the Constitution.

The material before this Court is sufficient to allow it to make an immediate per curiam opinion sending the case back to the lower Court, as was done in *Eastern Steamship Lines,* 338 U. S. 801; *Walsh* v. *U. S. ex rel. White,* 338 U. S. 804; and *United States* v. *Lee Wo Ship* v. *Shaughnessy,* 339 U. S. 906.

The Petitioner prays this Court to do the same item here.

PAUL NEHRING, JR.,
Petitioner.

CERTIFICATE OF PETITIONER.

This petition is filed in good faith and not for delay. It is restricted to the grounds above specified. The minute argument above is well grounded in law, on the basis of the criminal cases cited, and the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States which the Supreme Court of Illinois refused to follow in this case.

PAUL NEHRING, JR.,
335 College Ave.,
De Kalb, Illinois,
Phone 756-2741,
Area Code 815,
Petitioner.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30th day of January, 1967.

PAUL R. INMAN,
Notary Public.

(SEAL)